

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are numbered 20-24 and 47-54. The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated June 17, 2003 have been carefully considered by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider and allow the remaining claims.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The present Office Action rejected Claims 20-24 and 47-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,894,188 to Chakvorty et al. in view of Kamiya et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,320,138). In addition, the present Office Action rejected Claims 47-54 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakvorty et al. in view of Kamiya et al. and further in view of EP 731507 A1 to Takayama. Applicants have reviewed the above-cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 20-24 and 47-54 as amended is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Chakvorty et al. reference taken alone or in combination with the Kamiya et al. and/or the Takayama references.

Applicants respectfully point out that Independent Claims 20 and 47 of the present invention recite:

A multilayer electrode for a flat panel display device, said multilayer electrode comprising:

a metal alloy layer, wherein said metal alloy layer includes neodymium having a concentration of between greater than three atomic percent and six atomic percent . . . (Emphasis Added)

The present invention as claimed in Independent Claims 20 and 47 pertains to a multilayer electrode comprising a metal alloy layer. Applicants respectfully submit that the Chakvorty et al. reference taken alone or in combination with the Kamiya et al. reference do not comprise nor suggest in general a metal alloy layer, in a multilayer electrode, that is comprised of neodymium having a concentration of between greater than three atomic percent and six atomic percent (see Specification, page 37, lines 1 and 2).

Instead, the Chakvorty et al. reference pertains to a cathodic structure in a flat panel display which includes a row metal comprised of aluminum that is not a metal alloy. In addition, the Chakvorty et al. reference does not exemplify a metal alloy layer including neodymium having a concentration of between greater than three and six atomic percent, as is presently claimed in independent Claim 20 and 47.

The Kamiya et al. reference pertains to a wiring substrate that with a conductor can reduce the specific

resistance of the substrate when compared to an Al-Ti alloy thin film, and also suppresses the occurrence of hillocks or pinholes. Further, the Kamiya et al. reference discloses an Al-Nd thin film where it is preferable to set the Nd concentration at about 4 atomic percent. However, as a further limitation, the Kamiya et al. reference further narrows the description of setting the Al-Nd thin film to about 4 atomic percent at the heat treatment temperature of 250° C (see Kamiya et al., col. 6, lines 26-29).

Even if the teachings of Chakvorty et al. were combined with the Kamiya et al. reference to suggest a metal alloy layer, the combination is narrowly defined. That is, the combination of teachings of the Chakvorty et al. and the Kamiya et al. reference would disclose an electrode (cathodic) structure for a flat panel display comprising a Al-Nd metal alloy layer, where the Nd is about 4 atomic percent and set at the "heat treatment temperature of 250° C.

Applicants assert that the combined teachings of the Chakvorty et al. and the Kamiya et al. reference are sufficiently confined to the specific case of an Al-Nd metal alloy layer where the Nd is about 4 atomic percent and set at the heat treatment temperature of 250° C, and as such, does not anticipate nor suggest in general a "metal alloy layer that includes neodymium having a concentration of between greater than three atomic percent and six atomic percent" in

a multilayer electrode, of the presently claimed invention, as is presently claimed in independent Claims 20 and 47 of the present invention.

In addition, with reference to independent Claim 47, Applicants assert that Takayama reference fails to provide sufficient disclosure to broaden the scope of the combination of the Chakvorty et al. and Kamiya et al. references, and as such, does not anticipate nor suggest the presently claimed invention, as disclosed in independent Claim 47.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 20 overcomes the Examiner's basis for rejection, and as such Claims 21-24 which depend on Independent Claim 20 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 47, as amended, overcomes the Examiner's basis for rejection, and as such Claims 48-54 which depend on independent Claim 47 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION


In light of the facts and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 20-24 and Claims 47-54 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 10/8/03



John P. Wagner Jr.
Reg. No.: 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113